

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_124620
Title of the Manuscript:	Urgent need for GIS based dengue surveillance with the Google internet real time web mapping for epidemic control in India
Type of the Article	The article did not specify

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The article titled, "Urgent need for GIS based dengue surveillance with the Google internet real time web mapping for epidemic control in India" tried to use GIS tools for dengue surveillance. However, it is not clear if this article is a review or empirical paper. Also, the article is poorly written with excessive grammatical errors.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is ambiguous and does not offer any value. The author should make the title clear and free of unnecessary phrases that describes the methods.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract starts with an incomplete sentence and is poorly written. No statement of research aim, methods applied, key results or conclusions in the abstract. What then is the author communicating?</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript sections need to be all revised. The introductions did not specify the purpose of this article. The rationale section is not necessary and should be eradicated. Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 should be combined and named 'review of literature'. Section 3 does not add any value to this manuscript and should be deleted. Sections 4, 4.1, 5 and 6 should be named "methods" and combined. Besides, sections 4, 4.1, 5 and 6 that was supposed to explain the method applied in this article did not do that. Instead, the author presented a review of literature in the methods section. This is not scientifically accurate. The results was only half a page and did not say anything tangible or concrete.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The article is poorly written. Not robust or scientifically accurate. No statement of research aim, methods or key results. It is not clear if the article is a review or empirical studies. So many grammatical errors were committed in the article. The article offers no take-home message or key focus. It is just a cluster of literature without directions.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, it is not suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Christopher Ihinegbu
Department, University & Country	University of California, United States